

**General Assembly**

Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
5 December 2005

Original: English

Third Committee**Summary record of the 43rd meeting**

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 18 November 2005, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Butagira (Uganda)**Contents**Agenda item 64: Advancement of women (*continued*)Agenda item 65: Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century" (*continued*)Agenda item 71: Human rights questions (*continued*):

- (a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)
- (b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)
- (c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-60904 (E)



The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

Agenda item 64: Advancement of women (continued)
(A/C.3/60/L.15/Rev.1 and L.21 and Corr.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.15/Rev.1: Future operation of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women

1. **The Chairman** drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.15 contained in document A/C.3/60/L.21 and Corr.1, which also applied to the revised text of the draft resolution. The only difference giving rise to programme budget implications was that in paragraph 10 of the revised version, funds were to cover two years, 2006 and 2007, instead of three years, 2006, 2007 and 2008, as originally provided.
2. **Ms. Bowen** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, which currently included Greece, Italy, Mexico and Spain, drew attention to the new provisions in the revised draft resolution which sought to encourage coordination and collaboration of activities between the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) and other departments in the Secretariat which dealt with the advancement of women. The importance of the medium- and long-term stability of INSTRAW in strengthening the initiatives to be developed in the context of the fund-raising strategy and the consolidation of the revitalization of the Institute was reflected in the text of the eighth preambular paragraph. Paragraph 10 had been revised with the aim of supporting the core functions of INSTRAW for the 2006-2007 biennium rather than the three years which had previously been requested. In the absence of consensus, her delegation was counting on widespread support in the Committee for the provisions that would help the Institute to advance the empowerment of women from all regions.
3. **The Chairman** invited delegations to explain their vote before the voting.
4. **Mr. Lara-Peña** (Dominican Republic), associating himself with the statement by Jamaica, said that as host country to INSTRAW since 1983 the Dominican Republic had maintained its unconditional support for the Institute, including the provision of excellent facilities, equipment and services. Despite limited resources, INSTRAW had clearly demonstrated its capacity to deal with gender issues in areas such as security, international migration, good governance and political participation to coordinate its activities with other relevant entities of the United Nations system. His delegation urged Member States to support the draft resolution and take measures to grant INSTRAW permanent funding so as to enable it to conduct research to promote the advancement of women throughout the world.
5. **Mr. Berg** (Sweden), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom said that they were committed advocates for the promotion and protection of the full enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by women and were considerable donors to gender-related projects within the United Nations system, which should allocate more resources to gender mainstreaming and the promotion of gender equality. They had engaged constructively in the discussions regarding the future of INSTRAW to find a sustainable solution for its financial difficulties and had acknowledged the efforts by the Director to revitalize the work of the Institute.
6. As the aforementioned delegations had continuing concerns that the Institute lacked a comparative advantage in the area of gender research, some had withdrawn their voluntary funding years earlier. They could not therefore endorse continued funding for the Institute from the regular budget of the United Nations. They would vote against the draft resolution on the ground that the Institute's funding should come strictly from voluntary contributions.
7. **Ms. Ohashi** (Japan), said that her Government attached great importance to advancing the status of women and promoting gender equality. INSTRAW should be funded entirely by voluntary contributions, as stipulated in its statute. Nevertheless, a request had been made yet again for a subvention from the regular budget. Granting such a request was unacceptable as it would greatly damage the financial discipline of the Organization, especially as the regular budget for the biennium 2006-2007 could reach the unprecedented level of \$4 billion. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.
8. **Ms. Plaisted** (United States of America), said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution. It could not accept wording of the second preambular paragraph reaffirming General Assembly

resolution 57/311 whose paragraph 5 approved the release of funds which her Government had opposed. Furthermore, it could not accept the word "sustainable" in the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, as it indicated that funding was being sought from the regular budget. Lastly, her Government could not accept paragraph 10 because of budgetary concerns. The budget implications of the draft resolution would be \$1.3 million each year for two years, for a total of \$2.6 million.

9. *A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Japan, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 138 votes to 12, with 26 abstentions.*

11. Ms. Feller (Mexico) said that her Government affirmed its commitment to the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women as well as full implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action and the Millennium Development Goals. The Director of INSTRAW had set an example for other United Nations entities, turning the Institute's financial situation around and overcoming many obstacles. Those efforts should be supported.

12. Her delegation had noted with deep concern the persistence of actions which undermined the Institute. INSTRAW was a universal body undertaking projects to promote the advancement of women in every region of the world. All Governments were therefore urged to make voluntary contributions to the Institute.

Agenda item 65: Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century" (continued)
(A/C.3/60/L.67)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.67: Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly

13. Ms. Carvalho (Portugal), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.67, said that the adoption of the draft resolution would reaffirm the commitment by Member States to implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the outcome

document of the twenty-third special session, and Security Council resolution 1325 (2000).

14. *The draft resolution was adopted without a vote.*

15. **Ms. Plaisted** (United States of America) said that her delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution. Her Government was firmly committed to the empowerment of women and the promotion of women's fullest enjoyment of universal human rights and fundamental freedoms and had devoted substantial monetary and human resources to programmes and activities to eliminate violence against women. Her Government reaffirmed its support for the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, which constituted an important policy framework but did not create international legal rights or legally binding obligations on States under international law. It fully supported the principle of voluntary choice regarding maternal and child health and family planning but did not recognize abortion as a method of family planning or support abortion in its reproductive health assistance. Lastly, it viewed the reference to the contribution by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women to be an acknowledgement of the Committee's efforts to implement the Beijing Platform for Action rather than an endorsement of specific pronouncements or recommendations.

16. **Ms. García-Matos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that, while her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it was concerned at the emphasis on the commitments made in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), a document which it considered to be a working paper and in no way legally binding. Her Government recognized the importance of the commitments made at the Fourth World Conference on Women and supported all international actions based on the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, and it had developed a national plan for women and public policies and programmes accordingly. Lastly, her delegation did not endorse the reference in paragraph 16 to the commitment made at the 2005 World Summit to the full and effective implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), as that resolution limited the General Assembly's authority and concentrated more power within the Council, which was interfering increasingly with the domestic affairs of States.

Agenda item 71: Human rights questions (continued)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (continued) (A/C.3/60/L.25/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.25/Rev.1: Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

17. **The Chairman** said that the adoption of the draft resolution would not entail any additional appropriation.

18. **Mr. Rehfeld** (Denmark), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the original sponsors and also Albania, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, Eritrea, Ghana, Iceland, Jordan, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia and Papua New Guinea, said that the international community must continue its fight against disgraceful acts of torture that continued to take place throughout the world. He introduced some minor revisions to the draft resolution and said that the adoption of the resolution by consensus would clearly demonstrate the common resolve of the international community to eliminate all acts of torture.

19. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.25/Rev.1 was adopted.*

20. **Ms. García-Matos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation was unable to sponsor the resolution because it could not support the expression of appreciation in paragraph 19 to the Special Rapporteur for his interim report (A/60/316). In that report, the Special Rapporteur stated that Venezuela had failed to provide any follow-up information on the application of his recommendations. He had apparently forgotten that, as recently as August 2005, he had requested additional information on recommendations he had made in 1997 and had given a deadline of 1 November 2005. In any event, her Government had provided to the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights the information requested within the deadline set. Consequently, and despite the efforts made to soften the tone of paragraph 19, her delegation had decided not to sponsor the draft resolution.

- (b) **Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued)** (A/C.3/60/L.33/Rev.1, L.54 and L.70)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.54: Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief

21. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

22. **Mr. Wood** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union and the original sponsors, and also Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Ecuador, Fiji, Liechtenstein, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Turkey and Ukraine, said that the following new paragraph had been added to the preamble: "Acknowledging that in order to be effective such a dialogue should be based on respect for the dignity of adherence of religions and beliefs, as well as respect for diversity and universal provision and protection of human rights." In addition, there was a new paragraph immediately following paragraph 6 which read: "Condemns any advocacy of religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, whether it involves the use of print, audio-visual and electronic media or any other means;". He read out a few other minor revisions.

23. The sponsors believed that there was an urgent need for vigilance to prevent intolerance towards any member of any religious community. They trusted that the resolution could be adopted by consensus, thereby demonstrating the importance attached by the General Assembly to the issue.

24. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, the Dominican Republic, Iceland, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Sierra Leone, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Venezuela had joined the sponsors.

25. **Mr. Saeed** (Yemen) said that in the light of the consensus on the revisions to the draft resolution his delegation wished to withdraw the amendments in document A/C.3/60/L.70.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.54 was adopted.*

27. **Ms. Halabl** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her delegation had voted in support of the draft resolution because it was convinced of the need to condemn all forms of intolerance or discrimination. However, it had some reservations about paragraph 4 (a) which referred to the right of individuals to change religion or belief. The sponsors of the draft resolution should not have insisted on including that provision, which, since it contradicted the precepts of Islam, did not sit well in a text dealing with the elimination of all forms of intolerance.

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.33/Rev.1: National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights

28. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

29. **Mr. Mehrhotra** (India) speaking on behalf of the original sponsors, and also Albania, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Egypt, Eritrea, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Thailand, Turkey, and the United Kingdom, said they hoped that the non-controversial and apolitical resolution would be adopted by consensus.

30. **Mr. Gómez Robledo** (Mexico) said that Mexico wished to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution.

31. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted.*

32. **Mr. Wood** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union and also Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey, Croatia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, said that national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights were an essential part of the global effort in support of human rights and fundamental freedoms. They therefore

welcomed the emphasis placed by the Secretary-General on the need to build strong human rights institutions at the country level and the effort being made to encourage the entities of the United Nations system to work in close cooperation with those institutions. The European Union recognized the importance of such institutions and, where Members had not yet set them up, they were making efforts to do so. Thanks to the willingness of the main sponsors to take account of their concerns, they had all, for the first time, sponsored the draft resolution on the subject.

33. **Ms. Ahmed** (Bangladesh) said that Bangladesh had also joined the sponsors.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (continued)
(A/C.3/60/L.45)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.45: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

34. **Mr. Rock** (Canada) said that Australia, Bulgaria, Iceland, New Zealand, Palau and the Republic of Moldova had joined the sponsors. The sponsors were concerned about the marked deterioration in the enjoyment of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and wished to encourage efforts to improve the situation. Every attempt had been made to produce a balanced and accurate text reflecting the key concerns while giving due credit to the Government of that country for the positive steps it had taken.

35. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bulgaria and Papua New Guinea had also become sponsors.

36. **Ms. Hastale** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the States actively concerned about human rights in the United Nations system fell into two groups. One group held that all Governments, whether in the South or the North, were equally accountable; they favoured a promotional approach, including capacity-building at the domestic level. The other group believed that human rights scrutiny should focus exclusively on the countries of the South and that any concern to question the human rights record of developed countries should be thwarted; they favoured confrontation as an effective means of promoting and protecting human rights in the world. The latter attitude — taken by Canada towards the Islamic Republic of Iran and other developing countries — was an example of the

politicization of human rights by the West. Canada was seeking to pre-empt the structure and mandate of the future Human Rights Council to suit its own political goals.

37. Selective use of the human rights mechanisms in the interests of a few powerful developed countries had led to a further deepening of the North-South divide, culminating in recent initiatives by developing countries to block the abuse of those mechanisms by moving the adjournment of the debate. The objection to such selectivity and double standards was a matter of principle and brooked no compromise. Politically motivated actions had to be distinguished from genuine concern about human rights. Confrontational attitudes could jeopardize the good cooperation established between his country and the United Nations human rights mechanisms.

38. The draft resolution was a response to a bilateral legal dispute between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Canada and part of an effort to put pressure on her country. The international community was at a crossroads; if it wished for fairness and objectivity in the treatment of human rights it should block the draft resolution. She accordingly called for the adjournment of the debate thereon under rule 116 of the rules of procedure.

39. **The Chairman** invited two representatives to speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, before putting it to the vote, in accordance with rule 116.

40. **Mr. Lukyantsev** (Russian Federation) supported the proposal to adjourn the debate. He did not dispute that the international community was concerned about the human rights situation, but its current practice of targeting particular countries was politically motivated. The same States stood accused year after year. There were other countries that were guilty of human rights violations but they were not made the subject of draft resolutions.

41. **Mr. Kitchen** (Zimbabwe) said that selective targeting did not advance the human rights agenda; it was intended to serve the interests of the sponsors and to raise tensions. No country had an unblemished human rights record; the sponsors of such draft resolutions were themselves guilty of human rights abuses and ignored such violations by developed countries. They were seeking not to secure respect for human rights but to settle political scores. He therefore supported the motion.

42. **Mr. Rock** (Canada) said that one of the Committee's main responsibilities was to consider human rights violations in every country. He was aware of the concern about the country-specific approach, but the situation in some countries was crying out for appropriate attention. All countries were open to criticism; none was perfect. Where, however, Governments themselves condoned such abuses, the United Nations must consistently encourage them to respect human rights. If those efforts were blocked by a procedural motion, the message would be that the United Nations did not consider human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran to be worthy of its attention.

43. **Mr. Dauth** (Australia) associated himself with the statement of the representative of Canada. It was important that the Third Committee should continue to serve as a forum for addressing human rights violations worldwide. No procedural motion should be allowed to prevent a draft resolution from being examined on its merits. His country was opposed to such motions as a matter of principle.

44. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal to adjourn the debate on draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.45.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia,

Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Angola, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritius, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania.

45. The motion to adjourn the debate on draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.45 was rejected by 77 votes to 70, with 23 abstentions.

46. **The Chairman** announced that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.45. He invited delegations that wished to explain their vote before the voting to do so.

47. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), said that the draft resolution was selective and partial. Canada's politicized approach was harmful and discredited the work of the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

48. **Mr. Toro Jiménez** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation was against selective condemnation in the field of human rights and would vote against the draft resolution.

49. **Mr. Aydogdyev** (Turkmenistan) said that, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, his country was guided by the principles of engagement,

cooperation and non-selectivity in addressing human rights issues. It shared extensive economic, cultural and historical ties with the Islamic Republic of Iran and, because it was against the selective targeting of developing countries, and would vote against the draft resolution.

50. **Mr. Arziev** (Uzbekistan) said that country-specific resolutions caused misunderstanding, confrontation and mistrust. Member States must avoid using the human rights agenda as a tool of political pressure on selected countries. Uzbekistan would vote against the draft resolution.

51. **Mr. Taranda** (Belarus) said that his delegation consistently opposed country-specific resolutions because they were counterproductive and did not serve the promotion and protection of human rights. They produced unnecessary division and led to the politicization of the Committee's work. His delegation would have no hesitation in voting against the draft resolution.

52. **Ms. Adiwoso** (Indonesia) said that her delegation could not support the draft resolution because it was confrontational and highly politicized. It favoured a more constructive approach based on dialogue and cooperation and urged all those who were concerned with the promotion and protection of human rights to search for practical solutions which would be accepted by the targeted country.

53. **Mr. Hamidon Ali** (Malaysia) said that, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, his Government believed that human rights issues should be addressed through constructive dialogue. The exploitation of human rights for political purposes, including selective targeting of individual countries, should be excluded. His Government called upon States which submitted such resolutions to reconsider their actions, as the practice of "naming and shaming" only contributed to further polarization and division.

54. **Mr. Swe** (Myanmar) said that his delegation strongly agreed with the position of the representative of Malaysia and would vote against all country-specific draft resolutions.

55. **Mr. Erwa** (Sudan) said that his delegation rejected country-specific resolutions on principle, especially when they targeted developing countries. It was concerned that the Committee might appear to be monitoring human rights violations in developing

countries while closing its eyes to those in industrialized countries. His delegation admired the vibrant democratic process currently taking place in the Islamic Republic of Iran and strongly opposed politicization, double standards and selectivity. Indeed, within the context of the reform, the United Nations was engaged in consultations aimed at eliminating those very practices. The Committee should not be used as a forum to settle bilateral disputes.

56. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.45.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.45 was adopted by 77 votes to 51, with 46 abstentions.*

58. **Mr. Meyer** (Brazil), said that that his delegation had abstained from voting because it felt that country-specific resolutions should be adopted only in the case of the most serious and systematic human rights violations. In 2005, the Islamic Republic of Iran had received visits from the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences and the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living. It had developed technical cooperation on human rights with United Nations agencies and maintained bilateral dialogues with a number of countries. However, his delegation was concerned about the situation of freedom of opinion and expression, violence and discrimination against women, and cruel treatment or punishment. It was particularly disquieting that the death penalty continued to be applied to persons under the age of 18. Finally, his delegation remained deeply concerned about the wide discrimination against people from the Baha'i community. It urged the Islamic Republic of Iran to receive without delay the Special Rapporteur on freedom of opinion and expression and to continue to progress towards achieving respect for the human rights of all members of society, without distinction.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.